



To Teignbridge District Council:
planning@teignbridge.gov.uk

14/03400/AMD1 Non-material amendment (changes to access layout and cycle route alignment) to planning permission 14/03400/MAJ for outline - mixed use development comprising circa 230 residential dwellings (C3), one single form entry primary school (D1), retail floorspace (A1) together with associated public open space and highway infrastructure (approval sought for access)

12th July 2019

Dear Sir / Madam,

The Exeter Cycling Campaign has reviewed the proposed amendments to the road layout following outline planning permission having been granted for development 14/03400/AMD1. We are pleased to see that cycling is being considered, the Exeter Cycling Campaign has observed several elements of these amendments that prioritise vehicular traffic and not those choosing active travel. On this basis we must object. Please note that if the designs are amended to suitably address our concerns, we will gladly remove our objection to this development.

Exeter City Council's Residential Design SPD (2010) requires priority to be given for people walking and cycling and the recently revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 104 requires developments to provide high quality walking and cycling networks. Our objections are highlighted below.

At present we have significant concerns, particularly in relation to the main junction from the estate onto the A379. At present the design of the road is designed with an inappropriately-wide flared junction. The NPPF imperative is to "create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians" and "give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements". These are undermined by the existing designs. To properly give priority and safety to people walking and cycling this junction should be tightened and priority given to active travellers.

In addition, it is noted that the new highway designs show two lanes of traffic exiting the estate with one lane of traffic travelling inbound. Given the current drive by both Exeter City and Teignbridge Councils, serious consideration should be given to reducing the road space travelling in and out of the estate down to a single motor vehicle lane in each direction.

The crossing point on this junction is also of concern. At present, to travel from the estate to Marsh

Barton (just a mile away) four light controlled crossing will need to be crossed by those choosing to walk or cycle. A single full-length toucan crossing should be added to the designs at the estate entrance if cycling and walking is to become the chosen mode of transport.

A similar staggered crossing is present in the designs as a means to cross the A379. Very good design has been used on similar roads in Exeter, whereby a crossing with an island is in place for pedestrians, with a direct crossing for cycles. An example of where this works well, is Old Rydon Lane, where 6 lanes of traffic are crossed in one single light-controlled crossing for cycles.

It is noted that current proposals are to maintain the existing 2.0m foot and cycle way on the southern side of the A379 and there is a proposal to reduce the width of the planned cycle path to the north side of the A379 to avoid relocating the VRS barrier.

The **minimum** effective width for an unsegregated shared use path is 3 metres, although due to the size of the development, all paths should exceed this, should be segregated and of high quality to accommodate the level of pedestrian and cycle traffic avoiding conflict. This is of particular importance in this case due to the plans for a large through school in the area, the size of the planned development, along with the large employment region of Marsh Barton within close commuting distance. It should be noted that there are already regular conflicts between pedestrians and those cycling on nearby Sannerville Way and on the Matford Marshes path, so the increase in residents will add to this.

A preferred minimum width for a segregated shared use path with no side constraints would be 7m (3.5m for cyclists and 3.5m for pedestrians). This enables cyclists riding two abreast to pass another cyclist and four pedestrians to pass comfortably whilst complying with segregation. Following this guidance will also allow for the use of non-standard cycles (e.g. cargo bikes, tandems, tag-alongs and hand-pedalled bikes).

Thank you for taking the time to read our comments. We hope that these proposals will be considered when finalising the design for the site. We would be grateful for any feedback regarding any changes made as a result of our comments and as described should designs be amended to suitably address our concerns, we will gladly remove our objection to this development.

Kind regards,

Alex Tait

for and on behalf of:

EXETER CYCLING CAMPAIGN

exetercyclingcampaign.org.uk

Twitter: [@ExeterCycling](https://twitter.com/ExeterCycling)

Facebook: [ExeterCyclingCampaign](https://www.facebook.com/ExeterCyclingCampaign)

EXETER **CYCLING** CAMPAIGN